

REMARKS

The Examiner's indication that claims 10-21, 23 and 25 are allowed, and that claims 4-6, 22, 24 and 27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form has been noted with appreciation. The foregoing amendments effectively convert claims 4-6, 22, 24 and 27 into allowable form.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 9 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Anderson and claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over *Anderson*, and, although it is not entirely clear, Weaver.

The Examiner's explanation of these rejections focuses on Example A of *Anderson*, a procedure which employs benzene sulfonyl chloride. Accordingly, claim 2 has been amended to eliminate all polymeric monoaryl sulfonamides except paratoluene sulfonyl chloride, which the Examiner indicated as being allowable. It is respectfully submitted that as a result, both prior art rejections have been rendered moot.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that this case is now in condition to be allowed.

A change in correspondence address accompanies this response.

Dated: December 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Edward A. Meilman
Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant